

EUGENE CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY



Work Session: Envision Eugene Update - Social Equity

Meeting Date: January 12, 2011
Department: Planning and Development
www.eugene-or.gov

Agenda Item Number: A
Staff Contact: Lisa Gardner
Contact Telephone Number: 541-682-5208

ISSUE STATEMENT

Envision Eugene is a collaborative, community-based effort to balance the sustainability triple-bottom-line framework of social equity, environmental stewardship and economic prosperity in planning for 34,000 new residents anticipated in the next 20 years. This work session provides an opportunity to learn more about one aspect of the triple-bottom-line, social equity.

BACKGROUND

The City Council Vision embodies a triple-bottom-line framework, balancing social equity, environmental stewardship, and economic prosperity. Specifically, the vision is to:

Value all people, encouraging respect and appreciation for diversity, equity, justice, and social well-being, recognizing and appreciating our differences and embracing our common humanity as the source of our strength.

Be responsible stewards of our physical assets and natural resources, sustaining our clean air and water, beautiful parks and open spaces, livable and safe neighborhoods, and fostering a vibrant downtown, including a stable infrastructure.

Encourage a strong, sustainable and vibrant economy, fully utilizing our educational and cultural assets, so that every person has an opportunity to achieve financial security.

As discussed during the November 22 Joint City Council/Planning Commission work session, the triple-bottom-line framework will anchor the Envision Eugene Council work sessions in December, January and February, leading up to council decisions in late February.

Legally, the City must provide enough residential, commercial and industrial land to accommodate 20 years of growth, and establish a Eugene-only urban growth boundary (UGB). As important, Envision Eugene is describing how we want to grow; creating a future picture of what Eugene will look like, and “moving the dials” on accomplishing council and community goals for social equity, environmental stewardship and economic prosperity.

In late February, the council will be presented with a “tool box” of strategies and tactics to consider for accomplishing the work of Envision Eugene. The various strategies will have ranging impact on

“moving the dials” and the concurrent impact on satisfying a portion of the residential, commercial and industrial land need.

By state law (and consistent with community values), land within the current urban growth boundary must first be used efficiently before the UGB can be recommended for expansion. Practically, the council will choose a package of strategies that satisfies all or a portion of the land need within the current UGB, with any unmet residual earmarked for UGB expansion.

Each strategy will be accompanied by one or more tactics, which are the actions that must be taken to successfully implement a strategy. If tactics are not approved concurrently with a strategy, “phantom capacity” is created, and the strategy is not a viable means of satisfying the land need within the current UGB.

Several Envision Eugene work sessions are planned with council over the three-month period from December 2010 to February 2011. In December and January, the foundation for each of the triple-bottom-line elements – social equity, environmental stewardship and economic prosperity – will be presented and discussed. These work sessions will not include strategies and tactics, but baseline data, goals, frameworks, etc. Work sessions in February will begin to introduce strategies and tactics as the Community Resource Group (CRG) continues its work. Similar to the joint City Council/Planning Commission work session, different CRG members will be invited to participate in the work sessions to add their perspectives to the conversations.

Social Equity Foundation

The relationship between social equity and the Envision Eugene project touches on several important areas of policy and ongoing work within the community, including:

- Housing affordability;
- Access to jobs, goods and services, education, and recreation; and
- Neighborhood livability.

There is a great deal of overlap between the social equity and economic prosperity elements of Envision Eugene, particularly when it comes to housing affordability. Raising average wages has a large impact on a family’s ability to afford adequate housing. Therefore, quality-job creation should be considered an important factor in improving housing affordability.

Housing Affordability

As we plan for additional growth, housing affordability stands out as a key issue not only because the state requires communities to address it, but because it is a serious problem facing the community. The incidence of poverty has doubled in the Eugene-Springfield area over the past 40 years. At the same time, housing costs have increased significantly. While earnings for an average family grew by only 6.3 percent since 1970, median rent has gone up by 26 percent and median home prices by 144 percent. Although median home prices have decreased in recent years, the overall increase in home costs means that homeownership is out of reach for more households.

This puts a much greater cost burden on both renters and homeowners. Cost burden refers to the amount of income a family needs to apply to housing. If it is over 30 percent of their income, the family is considered cost-burdened. In 2000, half of all renters faced a housing cost burden, along with a quarter

of all homeowners. Among people in our community with low and very low incomes, 80 percent have a housing cost burden.

Other trends show emerging challenges, such as an increase in vulnerable groups as a percentage of the population. For example, Lane County's share of people over 60-years-old is expected to increase from 17 percent in 2000 to 26 percent in 2030. These individuals may experience greater difficulties coping with increased housing costs as their incomes remain fixed or decline.

Trends also show an increase in the Eugene's Latino population alone, which is the fastest growing demographic, increased 259 percent between 1990 and 2007, and is expected to double statewide over the next 20 years. This community may have lower-than-average household income, more poverty, and lower-than-average home ownership rates.

These trends are relevant to the goals and outcomes of Envision Eugene. Important discussions include setting an appropriate mix of multi-family and single-family housing, identifying where, and how, and what type of new housing will be developed, and considering the connection between housing, services and affordable transportation options. Another aspect for consideration is the impact of redevelopment on existing older housing stock, some of which is occupied by low-income persons. Displacement of affordable housing by new redevelopment projects should not go unaddressed.

Access to Services

According to the 2009 United Way assessment, many families, particularly those with children, are experiencing difficulty paying for and accessing services in all categories. Health care and other basic services may not only be expensive, but are difficult to reach for people lacking affordable transportation options. Cutbacks in transit service and a lack of housing opportunities near transit lines are contributing factors that hinder access to basic services such as healthcare, grocery stores, schools, parks and work places.

Integrating land use related decisions with transportation planning projects such as the Transportation Plan Update, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, and LTD infrastructure projects are critical to improving affordable transportation access. Another tool that is being discussed as a part of Envision Eugene is the concept of "20-minute neighborhoods". As a high-priority recommendation in the Community Climate and Energy Action Plan, planning for *20-minute neighborhoods* is a tool that facilitates the location of services within walking, biking, and transit distance of most homes.

Neighborhood Livability

As housing affordability and access issues have intensified, so have the pressures on Eugene's existing neighborhoods. New development and redevelopment has occurred more intensely in some areas, prompting serious concerns about impacts to neighborhood quality. Concerns relate mostly to the design and function of new building projects, additional impacts from new residents, transportation and parking concerns, and a lack of adequate infrastructure to support increased densities. The products created by the Infill Compatibility Standards and Opportunity Siting projects can help to address these issues and there is strong support from the neighborhoods to continue their implementation (see Attachment A).

Envision Eugene is not the only path to address the issues of housing affordability, access to services and neighborhood livability, but there are important tools we can put in place through this project that

can improve our community's collective quality of life. If we do not address these issues, we can expect the housing affordability gap to become worse, critical services to become more difficult to access for a greater portion of our residents, and neighborhoods to experience a decline in quality of life.

The January 12 work session will begin laying the social equity foundation for responding to this need as a part of Envision Eugene. The council will not be asked to make any decisions during this work session.

RELATED CITY POLICIES

- Most of the Growth Management Policies are related to Envision Eugene, most notably policies 6 - 11 relate to the topic of Social Equity
- Consolidated Plan Policies
- Diversity and Equity Strategic Plan Policies

COUNCIL OPTIONS

For discussion only, no formal action is required

CITY MANAGER'S RECOMMENDATION

No action is required on this item. Therefore, no recommendations are offered by the City Manager.

SUGGESTED MOTION

No action is required on this item. Therefore, no motions are suggested.

ATTACHMENTS

- A. Neighborhood Livability Statement
- B. CRG Worst and Best Outcomes for Housing (November 3, 2010)

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Staff Contact: Lisa Gardner 541-682-5208
Staff E-Mail: lisa.a.gardner@ci.eugene.or.us
Project Website: www.envisioneugene.org

MEMORANDUM

Date: December 10, 2010
To: Community Resource Group (CRG)
Re: Envision Eugene “Neighborhood Livability” theme

Dear Community Resource Group members:

Residents in all of Eugene’s neighborhoods have a substantial stake in the Envision Eugene process; and, through our experience as neighborhood leaders, we know that neighborhood livability is an almost universal priority for Eugene residents.

Consequently, we believe it’s essential for the Community Resource Group (CRG) to explicitly incorporate the following theme as part of any consensus statement from the CRG.

Envision Eugene “Neighborhood Livability” theme

Protecting, repairing and enhancing neighborhood livability is a central pillar of the community’s vision for Eugene.

To implement this theme, the City must:

- a) Fully achieve the goals that were unanimously adopted by the Infill Compatibility Standards Task Team.
- b) Implement the Opportunity Siting goal.
- c) When adopting Metro Plan amendments, rely only on those assumptions for projected housing capacity that ensure a) and b), above, can be accomplished.

Supporting principles and policies

This theme and implementation actions are consistent with the “Envision Eugene Guiding Principles,” including:

- *Eugene’s constructed and cultural assets, including a unique mix of neighborhoods, commerce, arts, architecture, and history are protected, celebrated and enhanced.*
- *We not only envision the future we want for our community, but actively work together to make it happen.*

This “Neighborhood Livability” theme is also based directly on “Theme 5,” which the CRG identified at your August 10, 2010 meeting:

The character of our established neighborhoods (including their open spaces) should be protected. Any changes to residential neighborhoods should enhance the character and livability of the area.

The implementation actions are based on the complimentary ICS and OS processes initiated by City Council as fundamental growth management strategies. (The ICS and OS goals are attached to this letter.)

Community Resource Group

December 10, 2010

Page Two

The theme and the implementation actions are consistent with Metro Plan Policies and Growth Management Policies, including the following:

Metro Plan Policy A.25

Conserve the metropolitan area's supply of existing affordable housing and increase the stability and quality of older residential neighborhoods, through measures such as revitalization; code enforcement; appropriate zoning; rehabilitation programs; relocation of existing structures; traffic calming; parking requirements; or public safety considerations. These actions should support planned densities in these areas.

Growth Management Policy 6:

Increase the density of new housing development while maintaining the character and livability of individual neighborhoods.

Growth Management Policy 9:

Mitigate the impacts of new and/or higher density housing, in-fill, and redevelopment on neighborhoods through design standards, open space and housing maintenance programs, and continuing historic preservation and neighborhood planning programs.

We recognize the community must collaborate further to produce finer-grained descriptions of "livability" and specific implementation mechanisms, such as development standards and incentives. We believe this work should occur through revitalized ICS and OS processes.

What is critical at this juncture is that a clear statement supporting neighborhood livability be one of the central pillars of the unfolding "vision" for Eugene. Without such a statement, there can be no claim to community consensus on a vision.

Thank you for your consideration.

The neighborhood leaders listed on the following pages are submitting this letter on their own behalf, not on behalf of their neighborhood associations. The organization names and titles are for identification purposes only and do not imply the organization has taken a position on the letter's contents.

Community Resource Group

December 10, 2010

Page Three

SIGNATORIES

1. **Aleta Miller**, Active Bethel Citizens, Co-chair
2. **Randy Prince**, Amazon Neighborhood Association, Co-chair
3. **Erik Muller**, Amazon Neighborhood Association, Co-chair
4. **Marcy J. Cauthorn**, Amazon Neighborhood Association, Newsletter editor; former Chair
5. **John Jaworski**, Cal Young Neighborhood Association, Secretary/Treasurer
6. **Barbara Mitchell**, Cal Young Neighborhood Association, former Chair
7. **Thomas Price**, Churchill Area Neighbors, Co-chair
8. **Kathy Saranpa**, Crest Drive Citizens Association, Co-chair
9. **Cathryn Treadway**, Crest Drive Citizens Association, Co-chair
10. **David Kolb**, Crest Drive Citizens Association, Treasurer and former Chair
11. **David Sonnichsen**, Fairmount Neighbors Association, NLC representative
12. **Carlis Nixon**, Far West Neighbors, Former Board member
13. **Carlos Barrera**, Friendly Area Neighbors, Co-chair
14. **Bernie Corrigan**, Friendly Area Neighbors, Co-chair
15. **Greg Giesy**, Friendly Area Neighbors, Board member and former Co-chair
16. **Nancy Ellen Locke**, Friendly Area Neighbors, Board member
17. **Jeanne-Marie Moore**, Friendly Area Neighbors, Former Co-chair
18. **Richard Edwards**, Harlow Neighbors Association, Chairman
19. **Jennifer Yeh**, Harlow Neighbors Association, Vice chair
20. **Marian Spath**, Harlow Neighbors Association, Secretary
21. **Jack Radabaugh**, Harlow Neighbors Association, Board member and former Chair
22. **Robert (Bob) Kline**, Harlow Neighbors Association, Former Chair
23. **Paul Conte**, Jefferson Westside Neighbors, Chair
24. **Garrick Mishaga Jr.**, Jefferson Westside Neighbors, Treasurer
25. **Sue Cummings**, Jefferson Westside Neighbors, Board member
26. **Della Perry**, Jefferson Westside Neighbors, Former Chair
27. **Joni Dawning**, Jefferson Westside Neighbors, Former Co-chair
28. **Charles Snyder**, Jefferson Westside Neighbors, Former Board member
29. **Carol DeFazio**, Jefferson Westside Neighbors, Former Board member

Community Resource Group

December 10, 2010

Page Four

SIGNATORIES

30. **Erika Seiferling**, Jefferson Westside Neighbors, Former Board member
31. **Angela Rooney**, Jefferson Westside Neighbors, Former Board member
32. **Jan Wostmann**, Former Neighborhood Leaders Council (NLC) Co-chair
33. **Carleen Reilly**, River Road Community Organization, Co-chair
34. **Beth Parsons**, River Road Community Organization, Board member
35. **Steve Norris**, River Road Community Organization, Former Co-chair
36. **Krista Rojas**, River Road Community Organization, Former board member
37. **Jerry Finigan**, Santa Clara Community Organization, Chair
38. **Ann Vaughn**, Santa Clara Community Organization, Board member
39. **Carolyn Jacobs**, South University Neighborhood Association, Chair
40. **Malcolm Wilson**, South University Neighborhood Association, Vice chair
41. **Janet Heinonen**, South University Neighborhood Association, Treasurer
42. **Mimi McGrath Kato**, South University Neighborhood Association, Secretary
43. **Bill Aspegren**, South University Neighborhood Association, Board member
44. **Jody Miller**, South University Neighborhood Association, Board member
45. **Mike Russo**, South University Neighborhood Association, Board member
46. **Marsha Shankman**, South University Neighborhood Association, Board member
47. **Tim Shinabarger**, South University Neighborhood Association, Board member
48. **Denise Sorom**, South University Neighborhood Association, Board member
49. **Mike Westervelt**, South University Neighborhood Association, Board member
50. **Nicole Sharette**, Trainsong Neighbors, President
51. **Deborah Healey**, West University Neighbors, Secretary
52. **Majeska Seese-Green**, Whiteaker Community Council, Former Chair

Attachment A. ICS and OS purpose and goals

ICS Task Team Charter (unanimously approved by the Planning Commission)

Section II. PURPOSE

The primary purpose of the Task Team is to recommend land use code amendments and other actions City Council can take to prevent negative impacts, and promote positive impacts, of residential infill development on neighborhoods.

ICS Task Team Project Goals Statement (unanimously approved by the ICS Task Team)

Create and adopt land use code standards and processes that

- (a) Prevent residential infill that would significantly threaten or diminish the stability, quality, positive character, livability or natural resources of residential neighborhoods; and*
- (b) Encourage residential infill that would enhance the stability, quality, positive character, livability or natural resources of residential neighborhoods; and*
- (c) So long as the goal stated in (a) is met, allow for increased density, a variety of housing types, affordable housing, and mixed-use development; and*
- (d) Improve the appearance of buildings and landscapes.*

Opportunity Siting Goal

Create a planning process for finding specific sites that can feasibly accommodate high density residential development that is compatible with and has the support of nearby residents. Facilitate development on those sites.

**THE WORST POSSIBLE OUTCOMES OF OUR HOUSING STRATEGIES
IF WE DON'T WORK TOGETHER TO FIND CREATIVE AND INNOVATIVE SOLUTIONS
WHAT WE DON'T WANT TO HAPPEN**

Housing affordability issues get worse. We don't provide affordable housing options. That low income folks are left with institutional uninspiring options that concentrate them in small areas and thereby create slums for the financially challenged and ugly wasteful isolating homes for the "haves." Affordable = ugly and unhealthy.

We do not plan for enough housing choice, so people can't find or afford a place to live. Poor people can't find homes. There is a limited range of housing stock available and it doesn't meet the needs of my friends and family. There is a lack of options at all price levels.

Housing un-affordability worsens and new home buyers can't get into their own properties. We are developing more unaffordable housing, huge houses on large lots with traffic congestion. We are in our cars more.

We have a bleak community with the lack of feel of community. We have more of what we have now, a City with lack of identity.

There is a collapse of social and political structures. Class wars. Inter city conflicts and riots between haves and have not's. People's housing preferences become primarily shaped by concerns about personal and property safety. Gentrification is the norm.

We build future ghettos. We create slums. Neighborhoods become campgrounds of the homeless. High density is built to phantom capacity; infill is done in a way as to create low income separation of neighborhoods, resulting in a small-town version of "projects."

Monocultures – 55+ in one area, students in another, low income housing in another, etc. Tacky houses – one after the other. Random sprawl. Encourages sprawl, is ugly.

We destroy Eugene neighborhood identity and character. *Our plan* destroys existing neighborhoods. Neighborhoods become sterile or unlivable. Neighborhoods lack life and vitality including trees, wildlife and habitat to support a diversity of life. Cookie cutter monoliths creep out /inside neighborhoods with no regard for traffic impacts, no big trees, lost family farms, yuck.

Impacts degrade and destabilize JWN and other neighborhoods. W 11th Ave through JWN has level of traffic, including buses and EmX that push owners to not live along it. The area between Jefferson Street and downtown becomes redeveloped with high rises and developed with incompatible uses.

**THE WORST POSSIBLE OUTCOMES OF OUR HOUSING STRATEGIES
WHAT WE DON'T WANT TO HAPPEN (cont.)**

We continue to damage our established neighborhoods through small scale residential infill, along the lines of the staff presentation, and many people are hurt and saddened. We are developing and destroying the older established neighborhoods, many of which happen to be very walkable, 20 minute type neighborhoods today. We tear down too many historic neighborhood/defining houses and replace them with multi-family units that are generic. The result is less of Sprawl.

Characterless neighborhoods get developed that have no sense of place; anywhere USA. Everyone's happiness is sacrificed and our built environment ruins our psychological health. That Single Family housing is on even smaller lots with even higher fences, people are isolated, unhappy, don't know that it has to do with their home environment and developers keep making enough money to keep building it like that.

People can't afford to live here or won't live here. Only a select few can afford to live here. We price people out of the market, so lose young families and kids. Our children will be driven away because of cost of housing availability of jobs.

New families do not come here because there is no affordable housing nearby and jobs aren't available. Young families are unable to afford to live in Eugene and move elsewhere. Eugene becomes stagnant and does not attract new vibrant opportunities and industry.

Affordable housing is in surrounding communities and everybody drives to and from. We don't allow enough land inventory for single family housing so the market goes to the surrounding communities and VMT are increased.

Schools fail even worse because neighborhoods die and there isn't enough enrollment. Families will continue to not move to Eugene – increasing the drop in 4J enrollment and lesser school quality.

We would not be forward thinking enough in our plans. That we would get so stuck in our varied views, that we would be stuck in our current stagnant view of our city. A strategy (ies) will be chosen that limits choice of housing that is the wrong choice in terms of market demand, causing people to live elsewhere and retail dries up, industry goes elsewhere and Eugene dies. We need to know how we going to live in our community strategy and create housing to fit the communities state.

You assume you know what the demand for different housing types will be, and then make that demand fit into what you believe are the correct housing project configurations. We waste land/opportunities for new innovative housing types that anticipate future needs. We create a housing strategy, because there is no way a set strategy will work.

**THE WORST POSSIBLE OUTCOMES OF OUR HOUSING STRATEGIES
WHAT WE DON'T WANT TO HAPPEN (cont.)**

We adopt strategies that don't work. It doesn't work. That we would plan for the wrong thing, the wrong demographics. The strategy is not market relevant. We waste a lot of time, money, and resources on planning and implementation that doesn't work (we built it, they didn't come). No one will follow the strategy and development will occur haphazardly. In five years, we use a similar process and to squander time and resources instead of using these more productively.

The consensus plan cannot be carried out because of state and local transportation facility requirements. We level and planned for the kind of community we want, but we *haven't* met the state land use requirements.

We continue doing development in the same way it always been done. We plan and plan and plan but in the end all development is purely profit driven so none of what we say matters. We fail to put teeth into our code or don't provide enough incentive to promote good development.

The developer builds according to market forces rather than community needs. Development is still haphazard – we rely on “the market” for good development. We do not allow the developers to be inventive. There is a lack of development vitality.

We unrealistically plan for higher density which we don't achieve. We limit what people can do with their land or we don't incentivize enough things to encourage infill and Eugene becomes a place that is not livable for current residents and not as attractive place to live for newcomers. We create only new lots that are tiny making larger lots on older homes to be too expensive for most people.” We build another ya-po-ah terrace (hey, it's dense).

Nobody actually wants to live in a more compact, urban environment and either what we build stays empty, or worse, it becomes a slum and what does get built and used is all in outside area. If density is increased too much we will be too close and neighborhoods will deteriorate due to lack of pride in our homes. We end up with a lot of crappy, second rate neighborhoods. We create chaotic, unattractive infill that feels like a neighborhood nuisance. It is unsafe inhumane living.

Incompatible housing occurs frequently throughout the city. Mismatch between housing type that's walkable and what is demanded in the market. This leads to high vacancy rates in some housing and unavailability in others.

We avoid expanding the UGB because it's too tough an issue, at the cost of allowing undesirable infill that fails to really address our needs.

**THE WORST POSSIBLE OUTCOMES OF OUR HOUSING STRATEGIES
WHAT WE DON'T WANT TO HAPPEN (cont.)**

Expansion of the UGB. Either by bad infill or by UGB expansion; our precious trees and natural resources are damaged again, and we lose the beauty of Eugene.

Large UGB expansion onto prime farmland, and its all wasted on large-lot, cookie cutter, single family, devoid of character, walkability, nearby employment or stores, then after we use that up... we do it again. We rinse and repeat until Eugene has sprawled across the valley floor. We can't redo it because the lots were all 7-10000 sq. ft. with a house plopped in the middle.

There is no agreement about how to move forward and the issue is decided by the courts. Conflicts get worse. We win ugly. We all lose lots of money and then we lose our homes.

We don't consider uncertainty around climate/transportation. We cannot be sustained as livable if (when) fuel prices increase

**THE BEST POSSIBLE OUTCOMES OF OUR HOUSING STRATEGIES
WORKING TOGETHER TO FIND CREATIVE AND INNOVATIVE SOLUTIONS
OUR PURPOSE**

We work together through this conflict to find elegant solutions to big problems. We shed our rigid beliefs and opinions and together formulate a plan that takes *care of* (fewer) Eugene's current and future residents. We think big. It honors the concept of compact urban growth. It reflects physical/fiscal constraints. It is cost effective for the city to serve. It uses land very efficiently. A great transit system exists and walking, biking is common and connected. It is not hobo-centric.

We create a plan that fits the needs of all including development of Single Family land in/outside the UGB. That we gather, analyze, and adapt a basic set of assumptions about demographics and strategies to accommodate those demographics, creating a plan that truly matches our community's needs and values. Decisions are made for folk "not like us" so we push more *outside* our own perspectives when creating solutions.

The pleasure we derive from the above compels us to cooperatively envision a plan and implement the processes to continue our nearby environment. We make our plans a reality so that citizens working with the planning department can together find the way to make lofty goals take shape on the ground. We work to develop essential, missing competencies in the Planning Division.

We have an economically thriving community that is ethnically, politically, chronologically and financially diverse with beautiful living spaces, ample parks and green spaces. We will have enough shelter and privacy, and experience wealth in the realm of community, shared experiences, caring and beautiful structures with ample and inviting open/natural areas. We have beautiful *spaces* and celebrate life wielding trees, and animals. A rich environment. It is beautiful.

Quality of life goes up and we protect valuable farm land and grow in a way that is consistent with our values. We protect and enhance the Willamette and McKenzie water sheds. We are known as one of the most "livable" cities of our size in the country.

We provide a high quality of life for residents. Quality of life for all income levels improves. Incentives are provided to implement strategies and density is increased while quality of life is maintained. We have sustained transportation, housing and employment opportunities.

Eugene thrives, *with* compact and vibrant neighborhoods, close-in and profitable small farms, well supported neighborhood schools, larger lot development sited and built with respect for natural systems. Natural resources are preserved to the best of our ability. Eugene becomes the easiest city anywhere for a newcomer to "find his or her place" physically and figuratively.

**THE BEST POSSIBLE OUTCOMES OF OUR HOUSING STRATEGIES
OUR PURPOSE (cont.)**

We have vibrant neighborhoods that celebrate culture, history, and have a connection to a network of resources and activities. Small village – type neighborhoods where we have gainful meaningful work, happy children, food growing amongst us and an intergenerational and socio-economically diverse population that shares its knowledge and skills to pass along what has been learned and experienced.

All areas of Eugene neighborhoods are preserved, redeveloped and created anew each with a unique sense of place. These neighborhoods have a range of housing types and other amenities available to their residents.

Neighborhoods become even more livable through adding new homes in a compatible way that respects neighborhood character. Denser developments are a good fit as infill in existing neighborhoods. Attractive, vibrant neighborhoods with a mix of housing densities that closely match market demand. Older neighborhoods like JWN are enhanced by appropriate development with right scale, good designs, and in the right location. Neighborhoods improve.

Development will be well planned and coordinated with neighborhoods so density can be integrated into the city in a way that increases livability. Nobody sues anybody else over housing development, because before we build, we plan collaboratively.

Every neighborhood develops its own identity and pride of place. Neighbors naturally work together to build and maintain that identity and pride. People once again know their neighborhoods.

We realize that to protect our neighborhoods we must expand the UGB to accommodate the future housing demands.

The UGB is not expanded.

We develop the best balance of housing opportunities for the people who would like to live in Eugene. Not what we necessarily think they want but what the best evidence tells us they want. Everyone can find and afford housing who wants to. Large lots are not too expensive for those who desire to live in that type of housing.

We create a mix of housing types that fits market demand and there are good desirable housing options for everyone. We build aesthetically pleasing, highly affordable medium density housing along the borders of our parks/open spaces (where appropriate). Small homes and small lots, adjacent to large, shared open spaces may be highly desirable to young families single adults and seniors.

THE BEST POSSIBLE OUTCOMES OF OUR HOUSING STRATEGIES
OUR PURPOSE (cont.)

We are able to build something new that the market wants and desires more of. New ideas in houses that meet the market demand. *We develop* creative building type solutions that foster neighborliness and safety. We create new housing types other than just single family – fenced yard – housing and R-2 10 lots per acre high density town homes. We would all live in LEED platinum houses (SF and MF)

A beautiful array of housing mixes/types emerge to meet changing needs of residents, respond to future growth/economic/social conditions and create fantastic jobs for crafts people in the housing industry. The best possible outcome is an availability and demand for multiple types of housing in Eugene; granny flats, industrial to residential conversions where appropriate, thoughtful placement of high-rise (near open spaces) new single family construction, “eco villages” (co-op living), and smaller lot sizes and smaller homes.

Well done infill becomes an asset to existing neighborhoods. There is a smooth and welcoming development of infill as reflected in the ECLA. We build multi-family dwellings in mixed use neighborhoods. We infill gracefully and create lively mixed neighborhoods where people want to live.

We develop our vacant lands and infill and redevelop before we allow building on expansion areas. Better creative infill of land inside UGB. Folks will want to live in higher density neighborhoods. *This approach* builds on currently underdeveloped commercial lands.

We have good looking, pleasant, livable, affordable homes. They are available at most income levels. Strategies work to encourage a broad band of housing types at all affordability levels. Housing that is affordable is also desirable because people appreciate the life style offered by their neighborhood. Amenities and creative design for denser developments attract a broader range of family types, reducing need for more Single Family housing

A range of strategies will be selected that provide opportunities for a broad variety of housing choices, that meet demand and providing a population base that sustains a commercial and industrial economy. This affordable housing opportunity creates new MUC neighborhoods and a quality of life for all. *Homes are* attractive to buyers (sell fast). *We provide* co-housing with a sense of privacy but opportunities to *interact* with common spaces – intergenerational.

A mixed affordable city with rich and poor black-brown-white culturally different people all living intermingled. Sharing the same public schools, parks, etc. with jobs, health care, good public transit – required for dense housing. Pockets of unique urban sub-communities throughout Eugene that, together with our current housing, offer a rich mix of options for living that begets more openness and marketability for homebuilders to enjoy

**THE BEST POSSIBLE OUTCOMES OF OUR HOUSING STRATEGIES
OUR PURPOSE (cont.)**

More housing downtown spurs a renaissance in the core of the city. We established and agree that we have almost enough single family housing already and we focus on successfully creating beautiful, green, sun-filled multifamily housing in mixed use buildings in core commercial areas. Downtown thrives. Both small and large industries thrive.

As a result of this green retooling, our home builders and developers prosper. Neighbors and land use activists care about the developers need to care about people's needs to live in the places developers create and the city need to provide services in perpetuity. *Housing becomes* money-makers for developers.

Public/private partnerships address affordability and development constraint problems.

Not only do we provide adequate housing for the needs we project, but people are clamoring to live there. Children and grandchildren have the opportunity to live here. People get to live where they want while wealth is being created, jobs are provided and the lives of everyone improved, oh and our schools are amazing. *There is* great walkability because of attractive street fronts, less need for cars due to ready transit and nearby amenities.

Everybody has a safe comfortable place to live and the means to maintain it. They are connected by public transit to worthwhile jobs. Close to transit and near goods, services, health care clinic, and healthy food options. Has good transit access.

The demand for housing in Eugene will be higher than for surrounding communities.

Eugene is nationally recognized as a model for how to create 20 minute neighborhoods. 20 minute neighborhoods thrive. People are attracted to 20 minute concept and seek it out.. People are healthier because they walk more. Vehicle miles traveled decrease. BMT is no longer much of an issue for Eugene residents.

We continue our reputation as livable, bike-able, green city but also embrace how we need to change.

"Eugene lives up to what it preaches."

"I'm not sure "unique" is good (goal)."